

II. Remarks

Claims 1 through 12 stand rejected. Claim 1 is being cancelled. Claims 2-6, 8, 11, and 12 are being amended. New claim 13 is being added. Accordingly, after entering this amendment, claims 2 through 13 remain pending.

Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The undersigned acknowledges the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 7-10, if rewritten into Independent form, including all of the limitations of any base claims. Accordingly, claims 1 and 7 have been cancelled and new claim 13 has been added, which is claim 7 re-presented in independent form including the limitations of its base claim (claim 1). In view of the above, it is submitted that claim 13, the sole independent claim, is allowable and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In response, claims 6 and 8 have been amended to depend from claims 5 and 13, respectively. Accordingly, there is sufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in claims 6 and 8, and therefore it is believed that this rejection is now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,558,156 to Tsutsui. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,738,169 to Stoynoff. Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,686 to Park et al. Claims 1 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 363065299 to Kido et al.

Without reaching the merits of these rejections, claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 13, including the limitations of the base claim (claim 1) and original claim 7. Specifically, claim 13 requires a protuberance extending from an outer edge of a vortex generator louver and having a generally triangular shape. The Examiner has indicated that such an independent claim would be allowable. Also, claims 1 and 7 have been cancelled, and the dependencies of claims 2-6, 8, 11, and 12 have been amended accordingly.

Thus, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and allowance of claim 13 are respectfully requested. Further, since claims 2-6 and 8-12 directly or indirectly depend from claim 13, the reasons for allowance of claim 13 apply as well to the dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 4, and 11-12 have rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoyhoff or Park et al.

As Indicated above, claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form as claim 13, including the limitations of the base claim (claim 1) and original claim 7, and the Examiner has indicated that such an independent claim would be allowable. Since claims 2, 4, 11, and 12 have been amended to depend from claim 13, claims 2, 4, 11, and 12 are allowable as well.

Thus, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and allowance of claims 2, 4, 11, and 12 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims (claims 2-6 and 8-13) are in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: Aug. 3, 2004


John M. Card
Reg. No.: 48,423
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000